DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 767 EA 014 795

AUTHOR Schmuck, Patricia A.; And Others
TITLE Analyzing Sex Bias in "Planning and Changing."
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Authors; Consultants; Content Analysis; Formative Evaluation; *Language Usage; *Periodicals; *Policy; *Sex Bias; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS Editorial Policy; Educational Journals; *Journal Articles; *Planning and Changing (Journal)

ABSTRACT

Analysis of the ten volumes of the journal "Planning and Changing" published from 1970 through 1979 revealed a low number of articles authored by women, the absence of women among consultants to the editor, widespread use of sex-biased language, and a lack of articles about implementation of equal employment and equal education opportunities, despite significant legislative activity in these areas. The researchers ascertained the sex of authors and editorial consultants, the organizational affiliation of authors, and the topics addressed by articles. Of 331 authors represented in all issues for the ten volumes, only 33 were women, and only 14 of these were not coauthors with men. These figures are considerably lower than comparable figures for other journals in education, though the scarcity of women in the field of administrative practice may account for their unavailability as potential authors. One issue from each of the ten volumes was selected for sex-bias analysis, and all 69 articles that were not regular features in these issues were analyzed. This content analysis revealed consistent male bias in language use and assumed audience. The document concludes with recommendations for change addressed to the journal. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218767

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Schmuck
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ANALYZING SEX BIAS IN PLANNING AND CHANGING

Prepared for the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association,
New York, 1982

by

Patricia A. Schmuck
Laurel Butman
Linda R. Person
University of Oregon

The legislation of the 70's which provided equal rights to American females in education has been unsurpassed in the annals of public education. Since that legislation the issue of equal employment of women as educational administrators has been singled out most frequently by educators for research and action (see, for example, Schmuck, 1975; Stockard et al, 1980; Biklin and Brannigan, 1980; Adkison, 1981; Schmuck, Charters and Carlson, 1981). Numerous projects on women and educational administration have been funded by both the federal government, primarily under the Women's Educational Equity Act, and private foundations such as the Ford Foundation which has sponsored Project Aware under the auspices of the American Association of School Administrators (see Jones).

Notably missing in all this work on women and educational administration, however, has been inquiry into the sex bias in the written materials of the field of educational administration. No comprehensive study has focused on the material content used to train school administrators, to inform administrators about current practices, or to guide theory about the discipline of educational administration. This paper attempts to fill part of that void; it is one paper in a series of six independent research projects which include a content

EA 014 795

analysis of the journal, Educational Administration Quarterly, textbooks in organizational theory, and textbooks used to prepare elementary principals, secondary principals and supervisors (Shakeshaft and Hansen, 1982; Ash, 1982; Tietze, 1982; Poe and Tempkin, 1982; Gardner and Vogle, 1982).

In this paper we explore sex bias in the journal, Planning and Changing from its inception in 1970 to 1980. A decade of this journal which focuses on the practice of administration was analyzed so as to parallel the years of legislation, research and social action in education.

We asked three major questions in our content analysis for sex bias:

1. What is the sex and organizational affiliate of individuals represented in the Journal?
2. What topics are presented in the Journal?
3. Is there a sex bias in the substance of the articles and features in the Journal?

I. ABOUT THE JOURNAL: PLANNING AND CHANGING

Planning and Changing is a referred journal; its referees are members of the editorial board as well as professors in the Department of Educational Administration at Illinois State University, the permanent home of the Journal. There are about 600 subscribers to the Journal; 44% are libraries, 41% are practicing administrators and professors, and 15% are universities (Ortiz, 1982).

The Editorial Board Policy, as presented in the Journal of July, 1970, was stated as follows:

> This Journal is designed for reporting the processes and effects of planning and changing--the development and implementation-for improved education programming of vital interest to school administrators. Its issues include reports of local, intermediate, state and federal action, program implications, innovative projects and research reports. It is not a spokesman (sic) for a single point of view. It serves as a focus for responsible contributions and a source of information for administrators and others concerned about public education, its goals and its productivity.

This policy statement was included in all issues until the 1979 Fall issue and was not afterward included. No policy change was announced, we presume this to be the policy still in effect.

II. METHODS OF THE CONTENT ANALYSIS

In the following section the methods used to answer the three questions are described.

Sex of individuals. Sex was determined by our judgment based on obviously sex-typed first names or by our personal knowledge. All Journal authors and consultants to the editor were determined in this way.

Organizational affiliate. Each issue of the Journal indicated the position of the contributing Journal authors. We sorted the authors into four categories; Department of Administration, a different department or college in a university, a school district and other (such as private consultant or state department affiliation.).

Author and articles. We defined author as someone writing an article which was not a regular feature of the Journal. Thus, we did not include the staff writers of regular features such as book reviews, editorials or conference reports. All authors in all journals were tabulated.

Coding of article topics. We developed a list of 15 topics to characterize the content of the journals; the placement was made by using the article title or reading the article.

Sex bias of article content. We defined sex bias as the degree to which females were included or excluded in each article under the following criteria:

A. Use of masculine singular pronouns (i.e., the leader...he).

B. Use of neutral referents when the sex of the role-occupier was not not identified (i.e., individuals...they).

C. Use of examples of avoidance of sexist language (i.e., use of he/she, chairperson).

D. Use of images and metaphors which have sex-typed associations (i.e., the quarterback position).

E. The degree to which the sex factor was pointed out in the study; (i.e., was sex mentioned in the description of the sample of the research subjects?). Necessarily this analysis was used only in articles reporting empirical data.

We analyzed ten full issues for sex bias. These issues were chosen in a consecutive sequence. Thus each volume is represented by one issue; all articles and features in the ten selected issues were analyzed. A total of 69 articles were examined, of which 46 received dual corroboration to determine reliability. Interrater reliability was above 90% and approached 100% in a majority of articles. In cases where agreement was not exact, the figures chosen for tabular presentation were always the lower figures.

III. FINDINGS OF THE CONTENT ANALYSIS

In the following section we we review the findings of our content analysis of the Journal from 1970 to 1980.

Sex of authors: In Table 1 we list all authors of articles by sex and year. The number of authors exceeds the number of articles because many articles were co-authored by two or more people.

TABLE 1

Number and Percentage
of Authors in Planning and Changing
by Sex and Year, 1970-1980

		Male Author/s Only	Female & Male Co-author/s		Female Author/s Only	Author, Sex Unknown	Total Number of Articles
			Male	Female			
V. 1 1970	#	20	--	--	--	--	15
	(%)	(100)					
V. 2 1971	#	25	--	--	--	--	18
	(%)	(100)					
V. 3 1972	#	26	--	--	--	--	20
	(%)	(100)					
V. 4 1973	#	31	2	2	--	--	23
	(%)	(88.6)	(11.4)				
V. 5 1974	#	31	2	2	--	--	22
	(%)	(88.6)	(11.4)				
V. 6 1975	#	32	1	1	2	--	23
	(%)	(89.0)	(5.5)		(5.5)		
V. 7 1976	#	35	5	4	2	--	32
	(%)	(76.1)	(19.6)		(4.3)		
V. 8 1977	#	21	1	1	2	1	17
	(%)	(84.0)	(8.0)		(8.0)	(not computed)	
V. 9 1978	#	23	7	5	5	--	28
	(%)	(57.5)	(30.0)		(12.5)		
V.10 1979	#	31	4	4	3		31
	(%)	(78.8)	(19.0)		(7.2)		
Totals	#	275	22	19	14	1	229
	(%)	(83.3)	(12.5)		(4.2)		

Total Authors: 331

A total of 229 articles were written by 331 authors; 83% were written by males only, 13% were male and female co-authors and 4% were female authors only.

In Table 2 the figures from Table 1 are compared to an analysis of the authors in six other educational research journals from 1973 to 1978. (See Lockheed and Stein, 1980.)

TABLE 2

Comparisons of Sex of Author by Percentage between Planning and Changing and Six Other Educational Journals Analyzed by Lockheed and Stein

	Planning & Changing	Lockheed and Stein Research *
% of Male Only Authors	83.3%	52.2%
% of Male & Female Co-authors	12.5%	28.0%
% of Female Only Authors	4.2%	15.9%

* Comparison data from Lockheed, Marilyn and Stein, Sandra. "The Status of Women's Research in Educational Publications." Educational Researcher, V. 9, No. 2, 1980, pp. 11-15. These figures were based on analysis of six journals from 1973 to 1978; see page 13.

The Journal, Planning and Changing, is considerably lower in its female authors compared with six other educational research journals. These are total figures for the decade, however. We wondered if the figures of

female representation would have increased from 1970 to 1980. In Table 3 we present figures for three different years; 1973, 1976 and 1978 to assess whether female representation increased. These figures are compared to those reported by Lockheed and Stein. 1978 was chosen as the last year for comparison because it was the most recent year analyzed by Lockheed and Stein.

The percentage of female authors increased in Planning and Changing; whereas in 1973 there were no female-only authors, this increased to 4.3% in 1976 and to 12.5% in 1978. Both these figures are lower, however, than in the comparison research reported by Lockheed and Stein. In 1979, however, female-only authors were reduced to 7.2% in Planning and Changing. (See Table 1.) Females also increased as co-authors with males; whereas in 1973 11.4% of the authors were male and female co-authors, that figure rose to 19.6% in 1976 and to 30% in 1978. This figure, however, was reduced again to 19% in 1979 in Planning and Changing. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 3

Comparison of Sex of Author and Publication Years Between Planning & Changing and other Educational Journals* by Percentage

Year		Male Author/s Only		Female & Male Co-Authors		Female Author/s Only		Number of Total Articles	
		Planning & Changing	Other Ed. Journals	Planning & Changing	Other Ed. Journals	Planning & Changing	Other Ed. Journals	Planning & Changing	Other Ed. Journals
1973	#	31	197	4	82	0	47	23	326
	(%)	(88.6)	(60.4)	(11.4)	(25.2)	(0)	(14.4)	(100)	(100)
1976	#	35	193	9	108	2	76	32	356
	(%)	(76.1)	(54.2)	(19.6)	(30.4)	(4.3)	(15.5)	(100)	(100)
1978	#	23	210	12	106	5	76	28	392
	(%)	(57.5)	(53.6)	(30.0)	(27.0)	(12.5)	(18.0)	(100)	(100)

* Data taken from Lockheed & Stein, p. 13, 1980.

Organizational Affiliation of Authors. Table 4 indicates the position of each author.

TABLE 4

Organizational Affiliation of Authors by Sex

Affiliation	Male	Female	Percent of Total Authors
Department of Educational Administration	106	7	34.0
University Position other than Educational Administration	102	17	36.0
School Districts	29	2	9.4
Other & Unknown	61	7	20.6
Total	298	33	100.0

34% of all contributing authors were in departments of Educational Administration. 36% came from those in other positions at the University level. 21% were in other positions such as state agencies or private consulting firms and 9% were employed by school districts.

Whereas male authors came primarily from departments of Educational Administration, female authors came from other departments or colleges in the Universities.

Perhaps one reason for the low representation of female authors is the scarcity of women in faculty positions in departments of educational administration which is the primary pool from which male authors are drawn. A female author in Planning and Changing is most likely to be in a University but not

in a department of educational administration. Planning and Changing is clearly about the practice of administration; the scarcity of women as practicing administrators or as professors of educational administration no doubt influences the uneven sex representation of authors of articles for Planning and Changing.

Topics of articles. In Table 5 we present the range of topics covered in Planning & Changing and discuss the topic concentration of women authors.

TABLE 5

Number of Article Topics in Planning and Changing by Sex of Authors

Article Topic	Male Authors Only	Female only Authors or Female-Male Co-Authors	Total Number and (%) of Article Topics
Administrative Careers - Preparation and Patterns	14	5	19 (8.3)
Student, Classroom Issues	8	3	11 (4.8)
School Finance	38	1	39 (17.0)
Equity Issues; Sex, Race, Handicap	4	2	6 (2.6)
Regionalization	13	--	13 (5.7)
Higher Education	15	1	16 (7.0)
Personnel Evaluation, Staff Development	6	2	8 (3.5)
Organizational Structure	9	2	11 (4.8)
Politics and Planning	30	1	31 (13.5)
Law	5	--	5 (2.2)
Planning Models & Forecasts	15	2	17 (7.4)
Leadership	8	3	11 (4.8)
Decision Making	4	--	4 (1.8)
About Research, Theory and Discipline of Ed. Admin.	20	--	20 (8.7)
Other - Energy Conservation, Community Education, International Relations	16	2	18 (7.9)
Totals	205	24	229 (100.0)

The categories of administrative careers, school finance, higher education, politics and planning, planning models and articles about the discipline of educational administration have included 15 or more articles each. Articles about equity, personnel evaluation or staff development, law and decision making have had less than 10 articles each about them. We can come to no conclusion about such area concentration. Does this reflect the interests of practicing school administrators? or of the editorial board? or of the research community?

Lockheed and Stein (1980) reproted that articles authored or co-authored by women were most likely to focus on women in education as compared to other educational topics. In Planning and Changing the most frequent topic represented by female authors was about administrative careers. 21% of the articles written by females were concentrated in this area. And that percent increases considerably when we add two articles about women and administration which appeared in Volume 11 (which was not included in our analysis). Presumably this high concentration reflects the social concerns that women have about achieving positions in educational administration.

In volumes one through ten, equity issues were addressed in only two articles in Planning and Changing. Lockheed and Stein report that 13% of the articles in the journals they analyzed were focused on women and education. Perhaps one reason for the low representation of female authors in Planning and Changing is the fact that issues of equal educational opportunity or equal employment opportunities have not been topics frequently addressed. Articles about implementation of legislation regarding sex, race or handicapped are notably missing.

We also note that there were no female authors represented in topics about the field of educational administration (which constituted 9% of the

articles), regionalization (which constituted 6% of the articles) and law and decision making (each constituting about 2% of the articles). The largest single topic represented in the Journal was about school finance (17% of the articles) and only one female was represented as an author. Perhaps the lack of female authors in these topic areas indicate that few women are working in these areas either at the university or public school level. Perhaps, however, it reflects the process of article solicitation, review and selection of the editorial board.

Consultants to the editor. The consultants to the editor serve as the panel of referees. Over the decade 25 different people have served on this board. No woman has served. The organizational affiliation of all the consultants to the editor are found in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Affiliation of Consultants to the Editor

Affiliation	Male	Female
University or College	10	0
School District	6	0
Other	9	0
Total	25	0

The universities and especially departments of educational administration are the primary sources of authors and consultants to the editor. We suggest the lack of women on the board may serve as another reason for the lack of women authors, as well as women's notable absence as authors in certain topic

areas. Perhaps a greater diversity of personal attributes of editorial board members would result in a greater diversity of authors represented in the journal.

Masculine pronoun referents. In all sampled issues of the Journal, the masculine pronoun referent (i.e., he/his) was used almost universally. Feminine singular pronoun referents occurred less than ten times in all sampled journals. Therefore, we did not compile a table for them. We asked whether certain occupational role types would predominate in this usage, for instance whether or not a particular role would be referenced as male more frequently than others. The results of this are indicated in Table 7.

Of the 69 articles examined, there were 364 or an average of 5.3 male images projected per article. There were no comparable female images presented. In Table 7, Column 7 (Other) words referenced as male less than five times were constituent, reformer, governor, faculty member, critic, policy maker, scholar, practitioner, proponent, decision-maker, tax-collector, user, doctoral candidate, apprentice, person, trainee, specialist, one, newcomer, analyst, child, expert, futurist, gifted student, assessor, manager, contemporary administrator, scientist, patient, physician, performer, subordinate, actor, superior, prophet, and coach. Words referenced as male five to ten times were intern and participant, and words referenced as male more than ten times were individual and candidate.

The idiomatic use of compounds containing the word "man" in suffixes and prefixes was also collected from the text. The use of such compounds remained constant throughout the ten years of the content analysis. There were a total of 123 such compounds tallied: an average of 12.3 per issue. A detail of the use of compounds containing "man" shows the most frequent

TABLE 7

Ten Volume Analysis of Use of Masculine Generic Pronouns by Year

Vol. & Year	Admin.	Prof.	Student	Teacher	Prof'nl	Man/He	Other*	Total	# of Articles (Pages) Analyzed
V. 1, 1970	1	-	-	-	9	-	3	13	3 (40)
V. 2, 1971	1	12	2	4	-	5	1	25	5 (44)
V. 3, 1972	2	15	7	-	-	12	9	45	6 (49)
V. 4, 1973	6	3	22	-	-	1 (3)	28(3)	66	6 (48)
V. 5, 1974	21	1	2	-	2	13(4)	9	52	9 (53)
V. 6, 1975	8	-	-	-	-	15	8	31	8 (52)
V. 7, 1976	8	-	-	-	-	3	21	32	8 (48)
V. 8, 1977	9	1	8	-	-	3	13(1)	35	6 (58)
V. 9, 1978	13	1	(2)	-	-	-	4	20	9 (60)
V. 10, 1979	23(2)	-	-	6(2)	(2)	(1)	9	45	9 (57)
Totals	94	33	43	12	13	60	109	364	69(509)

* See text for detail of this column.

() Indicates generic 'he' pronouns referenced through internal quotation(s) not directly attributable to author of article.

Rank in order of predominant single-category usage:

1. Administrator
2. Man/He
3. Student
4. Professor
5. Professional
6. Teacher

usage as follows: "brinkmanship" used 56 times; "manpower"/"manhours" used 14 times; "chairman"/"spokesman" used 14 times; and "mankind" used 13 times. In contrast, compounds in which "people" or "person(s)" rather than "man" appeared totaled three in all the issues studies. These three examples appeared within the last three years of the Journal.

In general, those articles published in the last few years increased in their use of non-sexist language following the grammatical guidelines set by the American Psychological Association. And in the last few years, articles which included a female author were more likely to have non-sexist language than were those written by males only.

Neutral pronoun referents. In Table 8 the extent to which neutral pronouns (i.e., individuals/they) occurred in the articles were examined.

TABLE 8

Ten Volume Analysis of Use of Neutral Pronouns by Year

Vol. & Year	Singular (Individual, Person)	Plural (Individuals, People, Persons)	Total	No. of Articles (Pages)Analyzed
V. 1, 1970	1	8	9	3 (40)
V. 2, 1971	18	6	24	5 (44)
V. 3, 1972	6	20	26	6 (40)
V. 4, 1973	7	11	18	6 (48)
V. 5, 1974	13(1)	17(2)	33	9 (53)
V. 6, 1975	6	6	12	8 (52)
V. 7, 1976	14	25	39	8 (48)
V. 8, 1977	1	8	9	6 (58)
V. 9, 1978	5	3	8	9 (60)
V. 10, 1979	6(1)	16	23	9 (57)
Totals	79	122	201	69(509)

() Indicates neutral pronoun usage referenced through internal quotation(s) not directly attributable to author of article.

Of the 69 articles examined, we found a total of 201 or an average of 2.9 neutral pronoun referents per article. This represents an approximate 2:1 ratio between predominating masculine pronoun referents (Table 7) and neutral pronoun referents (Table 8) or (364:201).

Obvious avoidance of sex-typed language. Examples of avoidance of sex-types language such as he/she, his/hers or s/he were found 20 times. Volume 7 (1976), Volume 8 (1977) and Volume 10 (1979) were the only instances we found of authors using such language construction. Of this total, seven came from one article in Volume 10, discussing language and administrative career preparation.

Worthy of note also are the instances where "he or she" was used to pertain to the administrator only after the male referent "he" had been used throughout the article. While we included this usage as an example of neutral language, it is not possible to see the article as neutral because of the frequent use of the masculine pronoun preceding the neutral form.

Sex bias in imagery. The use of metaphors, idioms, and colloquialisms was also examined as a measure of sex bias. This was perhaps the most subjective of our analyses as we had to interpret such language devices as masculine, feminine, or neutral. The most obvious categories included military images, sports images and games, and themes of conflict and competition. Of these we found eight images or metaphors focusing on the military, twelve focusing on conflict and competition, and seventeen focusing on games or sports images. Some examples of the latter are listed below:

> 'stacking the deck'; 'his able board quickly tackled'; 'hurdle-jumping'; 'Round I, Round II, Round III'; 'poach another's territory'; 'players in the game'; 'the chief administrator's team'; (having the) 'guts to pick a conceptual horse and ride it steadily.'

There were a total of 69 images and metaphors tallied. The average use of these declined from nine per issue in 1970 to 4.8 per issue in 1980.

There was a tendency, though tapering, to speak of the world in terms of men rather than people. Volume 1:1 made reference to Dr.'s "Green," "Black," and "So & So," all of whom were presented as men. In Volume 2:2 there were continual references to the young prospective employee as a "young man" and the "young professor who gives every indication of being a man of great promise." In Volume 4, Pohland and Blood write:

> At the very top, the man who cannot express himself will not be successful, for it is he who must communicate the essential meaning of business decisions and policies... Without the ability to read intelligently and write coherently, the young man is not a prospect for executive responsibility. (4:3, p. 150, 1973)

In Volume 5:4 an article begins with the following form of address: "Dear Mr. Educational Administrator." This form is utilized throughout the text, referring to Mr. Educational Administrator a total of five times. Though the article uses some neutral pronouns, there is already a fixed image presented to the reader of the educational administrator as male.

As late as Volume 10:3 we still found reference to "Mr. Green" and "Mr. Craig," both teachers, there was, however, a tapering of such references in favor of sex neutral role casting. Volume 9:4 offers examples of this, referring to "twelve individuals" who were contacted a condition which "helps to instill fiscal responsibility in program people"; and, "flexibility left in the hands of competent people."

The sex factor in research. One indicator of sex biased research and reporting is the neglect of sex as a variable for analysis. Acker and Van Houton (1974) raised this issue most poignantly when they reanalyzed the findings of two studies that did not account for the fact that "bosses" were men and "workers" were women. They point out the sex segregation of the work-place influences the power dimension of bosses.

Although Planning and Changing did not present many original empirical research articles, the sex factor was ignored in most reports. We did not compile a numerical report of this aspect of our study. Instead we have pointed out by way of example, two instances where we believe the sex of the research participants should have been mentioned or perhaps used as an independent variable.

One article by John Packard (Volume 3, number 3, 1973) indicated differences in the informal social relations of teachers at the elementary school level and the secondary school level. There is no breakdown by sex given of the population. One might presume that most of the teachers at the elementary school were female and at the secondary level there were more (and perhaps predominately) men. Perhaps the differences in social relations had not so much to do with the level of teaching but the sex ratio of the teaching group; we do not know.

An article entitled "Evaluating the Administrative Intern: A Focus on the Whole Person" (Patricia Koll, volume 10, number 4, 1979) reports on evaluations of the administrative interns and reviews the most frequently selected leadership potential indicators; she stresses the confluence of affective and cognitive criteria, yet she offers no information on the sex of participants. There is a substantial literature indicating sex differentials between male and female supervisors and supervisees (see Schmuck, Charters, and Carlson, 1981) which makes us wonder about the sex breakdown of the reported population. It is curious that while the author argues for intern evaluation based on the "whole person," she treats her data as if her subjects had no gender.

The neglect of the sex factor in empirical research is addressed more fully in Shakeshaft and Hanson's analysis (1982) of the Educational Administration Quarterly which focuses on publication of original research. We point out, however, that we must judge with suspicion those reports of research findings about educational administration which ignore the fact that subjects have a gender or infer that males' experiences are the same as females' experiences in educational administration.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our overall evaluation of the sex fairness of this journal must be negative. Although Planning and Changing is not particularly unique in this regard compared to other journals in the social sciences, the low number of female authors and the complete absence of any women serving as Consultants to the Editor is notable. The widespread practice of using generic "Man" terms and sex-biased metaphors, idioms and colloquialisms tends to discourage acceptance of and exclude references to women and also excludes them from an individual's mental images associated with the field of educational administration. It is important that greater parity be achieved in these projected images in order that all readers can easily identify, on a personal level, with article content.

There is also a notable lack of articles about implementation of equal educational opportunities and equal employment opportunities. The 1970s has been the decade of legislation in this arena; this interest is not reflected in the topics covered by Planning and Changing.

We recommend that the following steps be taken immediately to rectify the problems of sex bias in this journal:

(1) Females should be appointed to the Board of Consultants to the Editor. We suggest two sources. Names may be solicited from UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration) which has published a directory of female professors of educational administration in UCEA institutions, and from Project AWARE at the American Association of School Administrators which has several regional programs concerning women in school administration.

(2) The editorial board should adopt a policy to follow the guidelines for sex fair language set by the American Psychological Association for manuscript preparation and reject articles which do not conform to the guidelines.

(3) The editorial board should make an affirmative effort to solicit articles by females on any number of administrative issues.

(4) The policy statement of the Journal should be amended to eliminate the masculine marker word "spokesman."

(5) The number of articles about equity issues in schools should be increased.

While much of the sex bias in this Journal is perhaps unintentional, we believe a new awareness should emerge. Sex-biased material presents internal barriers to females in education, inhibits females from achieving their maximum potential, and presents a distorted image of the field of educational administration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acker, Joan and Van Houton, Donald. "Differential Recruitment and Control: The Sex Structuring of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, V. 19, pp. 152-164.

Adkison, Judy. "Women in School Administration: A Review of the Research," Review of Educational Research, Fall, 1981, V. 51, No. 3, pp. 311-343.

Ash, Michael. "Sexist Bias in Secondary School Principalship Text Books." Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, New York, 1982.

Biklin, Sari and Brannigan, M. (eds.). Women and Educational Leadership, Lexington, Mass., Lexington Books, 1980.

Gardner, David and Nagle, Lorraine. "Sexist Bias in Instructional Supervision Textbooks." Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, New York, 1982.

Jones, Effie. Director, Project Aware, American Association of School Administrators. 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, VA 22209.

Lockheed, Marlaine E. and Stein, Sandra. "The Status of Women's Research in Educational Publications," Educational Researcher, V. 9, No. 2, 1980, pp. 1-15.

Ortez, Julieta E. Private correspondence about Planning & Changing, Dec., 1981.

Poe, Cathy and Stan Tempkin, "Sexist Bias in Elementary School Principalship Textbooks." Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, New York, 1982.

Schmuck, Patricia. "Deterrents to Women's Careers in School Management," Sex Roles, 1975, V. 1, No. 4, pp. 339-353.

Schmuck, Patricia, Charters, W.W., Jr., and Carlson, Richard O. (eds.), Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials, New York, Academic Press, 1981.

Shakeshaft, Charol and Hanson, Marjorie. "Androcentric Bias in the Educational Administration Quarterly." Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, New York, 1982.

Stockard, Jean, Patricia Schmuck, Ken Kempner, Peg Williams, Sakre Edson, and Mary Ann Smith. Sex Equity in Education, New York, Academic Press, 1980.

Tietze, Irene and Charol Shakeshaft. "Sexist Bias in Organizational Theory Textbooks." Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, New York, 1982.